

**2008 SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL CHAIRS AND COORDINATORS MEETING
NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA
MAY 12 – 15, 2008**

MEETING NOTES

MONDAY, MAY 12 (COUNCIL COORDINATOR ONLY MEETING DAY)

National Updates

Presenter: Karen Brubeck and Elizabeth Moore

Notes by: Karen Brubeck

Karen discussed numerous council-related documents and associated deadlines. Planning is not yet final for FY09, but it is likely the deadlines/timing will be similar to FY08.

Council Critical Dates Table

- In preparation for the Conservation Policy and Planning Division (CPPD) retreat in early June, Karen will develop the FY09 table. The table is designed to help everyone plan ahead for and track all the deadlines for council-related documents, conference calls, national meeting, etc.
- Karen will develop and distribute the FY09 Table soon.

Quarterly Council Coord Conference Calls

- The next council coordinator call will be Monday, Sept 15 @ 3:30 ET. Karen will provide more information as the date approaches.

Annual Report

- Three council-related items typically go in the Hill briefing packets: annual report, fact sheet and directory. The annual report was not included in the Hill briefing packets this year because many sites did not submit the information--this is unfortunate because it is critical to highlight the accomplishments of our councils.
- Next year the timing will be the same as always. Deadline for site information is Dec 31. All hill briefing materials must be to the communications branch by Feb 4(ish); this is a hard deadline and if we miss it, it means our document does not go to the Hill. We need the information by Dec 31 to create the documents and allow sites to review, all before Feb 4 (ish).
- June Cradick noted that she should have this year's annual report complete and distributed in the next few weeks; June is the lead on this document.

Fact Sheet

- Every year the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) HQ produces a one-page factsheet on councils. This year's fact sheet has been distributed and posted. We use your council volunteer hours to create the factsheet.
- An email was sent out this year asking for each council's total volunteer hours for the calendar year; we need the information by the end of the calendar year (Dec 31) so plan to have it at your fingertips.
- The factsheet is included in the Hill briefing packets
- Ideally the council volunteer hours for the factsheet should come from the Volunteernet database but that is not currently happening because there is not 100%

participation in entering information into the database and sites have been working through technical issues.

Council Performance Measure

- FY07 spreadsheets were submitted in October.
- Council coordinators should be tracking the FY08 information on an ongoing basis.
- Usual timeline for this --- all spreadsheets due to Karen in late Sept. Karen reviews spreadsheet, does any back-and-forth necessary with the site, and submits all information to Helene Scalliet in early October.

Annual Council Topic List

- This document lists all the major activities and issues each council will tackle during the year, along with a few sentence description. The idea is to facilitate cross-pollination among staff and councils that are working on similar issues.
- This year's document was distributed and posted.
- Usual timeline for this --- site information due Dec 31 or ASAP.

Council Meeting Dates List

- This document lists all the council meetings across the program; the information is also posted on the ONMS Event Calendar.
- This year's document was distributed and posted.
- Usual timeline for this --- site information due Dec 31 or ASAP.

Council Directory

- This year's document was distributed and posted
- Usual timeline for this --- site information due Nov 1. This is staggered a bit to provide a bit of breathing room for sites submitting information and HQ producing the documents.
- This is included in the Hill briefing packets

Council Coordinator Contact Info

- Karen obtained current contact information from all council coordinators. Karen will update and distribute after the meeting.

2008 Council Handbook

- This document is updated every 2 – 3 years. The last edition was published in 2006. Karen is currently revising; the 2nd Draft is complete and undergoing review. Next steps include attorney review and communications branch review.
- Karen hopes to have it completed and distributed in September.
- It is critical that all council members (and any interested members of the public) have copies of the handbook – it is a public document.

Council Sections of the Intranet and Internet

- Karen continually updates the council sections of both the ONMS intranet and internet sites--look there first for current documents, templates, etc.

Council Charters

- This is a big year for council charters expiring --- 9 charters expire. Plan for 6 months to turn around the charter. Use the checklist on the intranet site.

- Karen tracks expiration dates and keeps copies of signed charters as a backup. However the sites should be the lead in tracking this and maintaining current copies of the charter on-site.

Youth Summit

- Several months ago an issue arose at one of the sites that prompted ONMS HQ to look into age limits on councils. Karen emailed out the new policy on age limits on councils several months ago. If you do not have it, contact Karen. The policy will be included in the revised handbook but was implemented immediately. Essentially the age limit for council members is 18 and the language explains why.
- However, the language also talks about the ONMS wanting to capture the interest of the youth and provided a few ways of doing so: (1) A non-voting youth seat is an option for a council, if desired; and (2) A youth “shadowing” program with council members.
- Possibility of a “youth summit” as a way to engage the youth and their ideas; can happen locally and/or nationally. Possibly put this on the agenda for 2009 annual meeting. Then possibly have the youth summit in concert with the annual meeting in 2010.

Food

- March 6, 2006 a Department of Commerce (DOC) policy came out that allowed the Use of Appropriated Funds to Purchase Food for Non-Fed Attendees at Agency-Sponsored Conferences, as long as you met a certain list of criteria. Initially it seemed promising in terms of being able to buy food for ONMS councils. ONMS HQ tried to obtain firm guidance as to how to apply it to councils, but was not able to do so.
- April 2, 2008 Legal Guidance came out that supersedes that DOC policy, which basically says you CANNOT use appropriated funds to purchase food for non-fed attendees at agency-sponsored conferences.
- The upside is that ONMS did not change the council policies and processes based on the 2006 policy (given that ONMS would have to change it back now).
- The downside is that ONMS is right back where we have always been. The guidance on food is in the handbook; basically sites should keep doing what they have always been doing.
- Liz indicated there is still a small hope that language will be included in reauthorization.

OMB/PRA Process for Council Application

- Every time the government collects information from the public, the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) requires an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) data collection number. The number on the ONMS council application form expires in Feb 2009, so Karen will begin a 6+ month process starting in June to obtain a new number.
- As part of that process, ONMS will have an opportunity to review and make changes to the council application form --- look for an email asking for comments this summer.

2009 Council Chairs/Coordinators Meeting

- Dan has made a decision on the location of the 2009 meeting – Thunder Bay. It will be announced this week.
- Karen proposed pulling together an FY09 Meeting Agenda Working Group. More on that later.

Updates from Liz

- Liz provided updates to council coordinators on the ONMS HQ Reorganization, the FY09 Budget, Office Elevation, the Climate Solutions Summit and the Blue Seas/Green Communities Initiative.
- Numerous council coordinators expressed a lot of concern about Sanctuary Advisory Councils being moved from the Conservation, Policy and Planning Branch into an Education/Outreach Branch. Most concern emphasized that although council members do conduct “outreach” and “volunteer” as part of their role on the council; they are most intimately involved with policy, management plan review, and ultimately resource protection; the connection with these key functions would be much more difficult to maintain across branches. Council coordinators were also very concerned about the “change in cultural” and perhaps change in priorities that councils would experience due to a branch change. Council coordinators felt the sites should be consulted in this process as it will impact them and their councils.

Council Performance Measure Discussion

Presenter: Helene Scalliet

Notes by: Karen Brubeck and Helene Scalliet

Helene introduced the session by describing the ONMS Performance Measures and discussed what makes a good performance measure. Discussion then focused on the Council Performance Measure: “By 2010, Sanctuary Advisory Councils will provide significant input on 150 priority projects across the NMSP”. Helene discussed the tracking plan and the reporting spreadsheet, and queried the council coordinators about what worked and what didn’t in tracking and reporting the information. One of the main sources of confusion was over “lumping” versus “splitting” certain inputs and the fact that council coordinators need to make that decision. The session was held to discuss the fact that in two years councils have basically achieved the measure, providing 149 inputs by 2007. Several options were considered to address this: (1) Keep the same measure, but revise the target number; (2) Change the focus of the council measure entirely; or (3) Keep council measure as is. After a lot of discussion about the pros and cons of each, a decision was made to maintain this same performance measure, as it would not be useful to alter it mid-stream. Helene did agree to work with the council coordinators to firm up the guidance; perhaps including a question that further links the input back to resource protection.

Actions:

- Karen will distribute all site spreadsheets for FY07 to increase the consistency of what council coordinators are reporting.
- Helene will work with council coordinators to firm up the guidance; perhaps including a question that further links the input back to resource protection.

Volunteernet Discussion

Presenter: Kate Thompson and Matt Dozier

Notes by: Karen Brubeck

Kate introduced the session by discussing the volunteer performance measure: “By 2010, increase by 25% the number of volunteer hours dedicated to ONMS science,

public awareness and resource protection activities.” She stated that the Volunteernet database was developed specifically to track this performance measure and therefore it is VERY important that council coordinators and volunteer coordinators input their hours into the database.

Numerous council coordinators expressed significant frustration with the technical issues they have encountered, the fact that the database is not particularly user-friendly, questions about the necessity of using the database, and concerns about the fact that since they have used their own database on-site for years that this is a duplicative effort.

In response, Kate acknowledged the database had shortcomings, but there is no money in the budget to fix it at this point. She also added that initially she was requesting that coordinators enter hours into the database monthly, but quarterly seems more realistic. Kate emphasized that even if you are having technical difficulties with the database, to simply email the total volunteer hours to Kate and Matt, along with the council seat and what they are working on. She noted it is even possible to create a single “group” that would include the entire council and enter the hours into the database as a lump sum. She noted that if there was information the council coordinators do not collect or do not want to share (a home address, etc) then the main address of the sanctuary office could be substituted. She emphasized how critical of a component council volunteer hours are to this measure and the necessity of capturing the hours.

Karen Brubeck noted that the driver for development of VolunteerNet was the volunteer performance measure. In fact, the database was fully developed before councils were added as a requirement. Therefore, although the ideal scenario had been that the information input into the database could be used to create the council fact sheet and directory, this has not materialized mainly because there is not 100% participation and all of the technical issues. Therefore, the information for the council fact sheet and directory still must be requested separately.

In order to make the council volunteer hours tracked consistent with the other program volunteers, council coordinators should count the following as volunteer hours: council meetings, working group meetings, subcommittee meetings, meeting prep time, travel time to and from meetings, and outside presentations and activities on behalf of the council.

For the purposes of volunteer hours, all council members should be considered “volunteer”. We recognize some government agencies or even non-profits pay their representatives to sit on our councils. Yet, technically speaking then it is the other government agencies and non-profits that are providing ONMS an “in-kind” donation of their employees’ time.

A significant amount of time was dedicated to discussion of work Kate has been doing to build-out the ONMS volunteer program. One of these items involves all volunteers (including council members) being required to fill out an SF-52 form once they are selected to sit on our councils—this provides insurance coverage in the event, for example, the individual is hurt while at our council meeting. Kate also mentioned that all volunteers will be required to undergo an in-depth background check. There was much concern about this particular item as council members already undergo a Lexus/Nexus and bureau checks, and the member recruitment/selection process is already incredibly long and this would simply add to it. Liz assured council coordinators that given the

checks they already go through, they would not be required to undergo further checks. Kate noted that the cost of the background checks was also very much an issue --- it is very expensive. This will all be detailed in the DRAFT Volunteer Guide/Handbook which Kate will distribute to council coordinators for comment. Once final, this information will also be incorporated into the revised Council Handbook to be completed this fall.

Actions:

- Kate will email the council coordinators the quarterly submission schedule.
- Council coordinators will enter council volunteer hours quarterly.
- Kate will distribute the DRAFT Volunteer Guide/Handbook to council coordinators and volunteer coordinators for comment in late May; once she receives comments, she will finalize and distribute to all.
- Kate will ensure a letter comes from ONMS (possibly Dan) regarding SF-52s.
- Karen will incorporate the SF-52, as it applies to council members, into the council handbook once it is final (it may or may not make it into the 2008 handbook).

State of the Councils Discussion

Facilitator: June Cradick

Notes by: Karen Brubeck

Actions:

- June Cradick will summarize the session and conduct any next steps.

Open Discussion

Facilitator: Karen Brubeck

Notes by: Karen Brubeck

The majority of this session was used to finish both the State of the Councils session and the Council Performance Measure session.

In the remaining time Keeley Belva provided an update on the Monument, Reserve Advisory Council and possible advisory body in the future. A small amount of time was also allotted to discussion of the council roles in the Thunder Bay and Cordell Bank/Gulf of the Farallones boundary expansion efforts.

TUESDAY, MAY 13

State of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries

Presenter: Dan Basta

Notes by: Jennifer Morgan

Dan began by noting that The Mariner's Museum and the Monitor NMS offices were the location of one of his first meetings with National Marine Sanctuary Program staff when he took lead of the program in 1999. After a brief update on budget, the appropriations bill, and the sanctuary caucus in the House of Representatives, Dan began a comparison of "then" and "now", highlighting the accomplishments of the program since 1999. He mentioned the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (NMSF) Board of Directors, a large list of luminaries that are 'going to bat' for us. He also noted that it is the high-profile events—expeditions, films—that build momentum for the program. In 1999, eight sanctuary advisory councils were in existence; today there are fourteen. He stated that the advisory councils are a body of momentum and are significant drivers; they all have something to say about the state of their communities and are listened to. In 1999 there was no pending legislation in congress; today there are numerous expansion bills for marine sanctuaries. The program now believes that we are leaders in marine conservation. He stated that it is often not about the sanctuaries, but about affecting all Americans and their beliefs about conservation. Dan discussed the importance of using heritage and history (e.g. The Monitor, the history of whaling captured in shipwrecks in the Arctic) to tell a story and do meaningful, useful things to peak the interest of Americans. Dan also discussed the importance of the "messy process" of public involvement. He emphasized that our councils are about active engagement and benefit from the pluralism of interests on the council. The public process can be difficult, but the struggle is necessary and leads to change. He added that there is danger in decisive action in a moment when it is outside of the public process. Dan discussed the strong organizational structure of the now ONMS and the importance of the regional focus. Dan briefly touched other topics including: greening, international programs, the "Islands in the Stream" initiative, the recent climate summit on the west coast, an agreement with Department of Energy to use sanctuary facilities as demonstration projects, Capitol Hill Oceans Week (CHOW), recent media projects and films, and new program vessels. Dan finished by emphasizing that the program is about dedication to a purposeful end; the importance of making decisions that will affect change not next year, but in ten years and beyond. He stated that this is the end of the beginning; we (ONMS) are now poised to make an impact on society that nobody has dreamt about. It is about being part of the fabric of change.

Monitor NMS

Presenter: Dave Alberg

Notes by: Shannon Ricles

Dave Alberg, Superintendent of the *Monitor* NMS, gave an overview of the USS *Monitor* and its sanctuary. He told how the USS *Monitor* was originally built during the Civil War as a countermeasure to the Confederate's CSS *Virginia*. He also explained the USS *Monitor*'s importance to our nation's history as the first ironclad ship with revolutionary technology of a rotating turret that helped to change maritime warfare for all times. Dave continued by describing the Battle of Hampton Roads and how neither the *Monitor* nor

the *Virginia* truly won the day although both claimed victory. He further explained how the ship went down while being towed during a storm off the coast of North Carolina where it laid undetected until 1973 when it was discovered by John G. Newton of Duke University Marine Laboratory. On January 30, 1975, the 113th anniversary of the *Monitor's* launching at Greenpoint, NY, the *Monitor* National Marine Sanctuary was established making it the nation's first marine sanctuary.

Dave detailed the documentation of the USS *Monitor's* progressive degradation due to both human and natural causes. He indicated that in order to preserve this important piece of history certain iconic pieces of the USS *Monitor* were brought up from the ship's site to be restored and housed at the Mariners' Museum in Newport News, VA. Dave described the lengthy recovery process and the various partnerships, including the US Navy, that were instrumental in bringing up the propeller, turret, Dahlgren guns, and various other smaller pieces. The Mariner's Museum, with the support of NOAA and the *Monitor* NMS, constructed a \$35 million exhibit hall to tell the *Monitor's* story, showcase the artifacts, and continue the conservation efforts of the turret and other pieces of the *Monitor*.

Dave concluded his presentation by describing the *Monitor* NMS's participation in various outreach and educational opportunities. He also talked about future endeavors such as the documenting and surveying of three U-Boat wreck sites in the Atlantic and the need for protection of various shipwrecks within the Graveyard of the Atlantic.

National Marine Sanctuaries Act Reauthorization

Presenter: Elizabeth Moore

Notes by: Lilli Ferguson

This was a verbal presentation, with an accompanying handout. Liz defined what reauthorization is, outlined the history of reauthorization (2003 – present), major provisions of the bill, and next steps.

Liz said the National Marine Sanctuaries Act was due for reauthorization in 2005. In January of that year, the bill got to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and is still there now. The primary purpose of the National Marine Sanctuary system is resource protection. The bill had language to clarify how to select new sites, lifted the moratorium on getting new sites designated, and added language in the Antiquities Act for including many sanctuary management tools such as advisory councils and enforcement, etc. Liz also said she has heard that, in the future, new congressional bills pertaining to sanctuaries may be introduced, and that the ONMS hopes to be consulted, so that many of the same provisions as the bill she reviewed for the group may be included.

Liz said that councils should follow the guidance on page 22 of the Council Handbook if they want to provide comments on any reauthorization bills introduced by Congress, to avoid any problems with lobbying.

Northeast/Mid-Atlantic/Great Lakes Region NMSP Case Study
Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary Case Study 2006/2007
Presenters: Nathalie Ward and Susan Farady
Notes By: Nathalie Ward

The Stellwagen Bank NMS Advisory Council (council) has contributed toward four significant marine mammal protection efforts in 2006 and 2007, which have significant policy, research and outreach implications both nationally and internationally. These conservation actions include the implementation of the 1) Traffic Separation Scheme (TSS); 2) Acoustic Marine Mammal Research Projects; 3) Sister Sanctuary Initiative; and 4) Monitoring Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Ports. Each initiative was reviewed, discussed and voted on by the council through working group recommendations as part of the Management Plan Review (MPR) or was a direct council action voted on in 2006/2007. For many of the marine mammal species, the biological productivity of sanctuary waters provides primary habitat for feeding and nursing. In fact, the sanctuary (and the Gulf of Maine—GoM) is one of the most intensively used cetacean habitats in the northeast continental shelf region of the United States.

I. Traffic Separation Scheme

NOAA's Stellwagen Bank sanctuary's proposal to the International Maritime Organization (IMO), regarding the Traffic Separation Scheme (TSS), was to shift the shipping lanes 10 degrees northward in order to reduce the risk to ship strikes to endangered North Atlantic right whales and other baleen whales in the sanctuary. The IMO approved the shift in shipping lanes on 8 December 2006. The move went into effect July 1, 2007. It is believed that this step will provide one more safeguard for the world's endangered and threatened cetaceans. It is the first time that the IMO has initiated a lane shift to protect marine mammals in the United States.

II. Acoustic Marine Mammal Research Projects

Reducing mortality caused by entanglement in commercial fishing gear and ship strike requires an understanding of how whales use the water column relative to human activities. Pioneering acoustic research at SBNMS is using state-of-the-art technologies to both 1) track the behavior of whales and evaluate their use of sea floor and water column habitats, and 2) characterize and monitor the contributions of various sound sources to the sanctuary's underwater noise budget. This research is generating multiple sources of data that can be used to minimize and mitigate threats to marine mammals in and around the Stellwagen Bank sanctuary.

Acoustic Recording Tags on Humpback Whales

Acoustic data allows virtual visualization of the underwater activities of a tagged animal, concurrent with the sounds the animal makes and is exposed to, shipping tracks, prey resources and other measured aspects of the environment, and thus can be used to develop effective management tools. Information has been instrumental in decisions by the NMFS to require the use of sinking groundline for New England trap/pot fisheries starting in October of 2008.

Acoustics Research: In December 2007, Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary (SBNMS) and collaborators from SBNMS began a three-year project that to characterize the underwater acoustic environment (10–1000 Hz) of the sanctuary. Research data will be used to study acoustic densities and distributions of vocalizing whales within the SBNMS, as well as to examine the relative inputs of noise from vessels and other

sources. This project builds upon previous efforts to assess the relative contributions of different types of vessels and other sound sources to the total "noise budget" of the sanctuary. Automatic Identification System (AIS) data will be used to continuously track all large vessel traffic in greater sanctuary waters. In addition to their use in examining shipping noise, ARUs will be used to detect vocalizing large whale species, such as North Atlantic right whales, humpback whales and fin whales.

III. Sister Sanctuary Relationship to Protect Humpback Whales

The Director of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on December 8, 2006 with the Minister of the Environment and Natural Resources in the Dominican Republic to establish the *first* sister sanctuary to protect the endangered humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). The MOU signing marks a new chapter for the joint management of the humpback whale. The sister sanctuary initiative is the *first international relationship* in the world to *protect an endangered migratory species on both ends of its range*—in its northern feeding and nursery grounds in the SBNMS and its southern mating and calving grounds in Marinos Mammíferos de Sanctuario de Republica Dominicana (SMMRD).

The MOU delineates the general terms, objectives and responsibilities of the sister sanctuary relationship, which aims to enhance an ecosystem-based approach to cooperative sanctuary management through capacity building, research, monitoring, and education. The sister sanctuary relationship can clearly play a powerful role in protecting endangered humpback whales (transboundary species), preserving special marine areas, increasing public awareness and support for marine mammal conservation, and providing sites for research and monitoring.

IV. Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Ports as Pertains to Marine Mammals

Based on the information provided by the United States Coast Guard (USCG) and Marine Administration (MARAD), the ONMS found that two applications to construct and operate offshore terminals to import LNG adjacent to the sanctuary's western boundary, were likely to have significant, constant, long-term, adverse affects upon marine resources of the SBNMS due to the following: the increased risk of ship strike to the sanctuary's endangered whale populations, including the North Atlantic right whale; increased acoustic exposure to marine mammal and fish species; increased risk of whale entanglement and loss of the benthic habitat in the sanctuary due to displaced fishing effort; possible re-suspension of toxic materials during construction; diminished visual aesthetics; and entrainment of planktonic and fishery resources by LNG carriers at port and during transit. Consultations resulted in the development of several recommendations regarding mitigation and monitoring activities that would further assess and/or prevent impacts to sanctuary species and habitats.

As mandated under the company's license, Automatic Recording Units (ARUs) and Automatic Detection Buoys (ABs) were deployed surrounding the LNG Port site. The ARU array is being used to examine contributions of noise from pre-construction, construction and operation phases and to monitor vocally-active populations in the area, and will be deployed for a five-year monitoring period. The construction and operation AB arrays are being used to detect whale vocalizations within their receiving range (5-10 nautical miles) and transmit a signal in real-time to construction personnel or LNG tanker operators. In January 2008, ten ABs were placed at regular intervals through the portion of the newly-aligned Boston Traffic Separation Scheme (Boston TSS) that runs through the SBNMS. The ABs will be used to alert transiting LNG vessels to the

presence of vocalizing whales, triggering the vessels to slow their speeds and heighten their visual awareness. The LNG Port's license mandates the use of this array of ABs in the TSS for the life of the Port.

Southeast/Gulf of Mexico/Caribbean Region Case Study

Presenter: Joe Kimmel

Notes by: Becky Shortland

Regional Director Billy Causey introduced the case study for the Southeast/Gulf of Mexico/Caribbean Region. He noted that in developing the case study between the three sites – Florida Keys, Gray's Reef and Flower Garden Banks national marine sanctuaries – it became clear that a common thread existed in marine zoning. Dr. Joe Kimmel, Gray's Reef NMS Advisory Council Chair gave the presentation, which combined activities at all three sites focusing on the critical involvement of advisory councils and other stakeholders and accountability back to those constituents.

Dr. Kimmel highlighted the success in marine zoning activities first with Flower Garden Banks where the advisory council has provided substantive leadership in identifying locations for possible boundary expansion and a recommendation to zone in existing sanctuary boundaries for research and resource protection. The presentation then moved on to the research area proposal for Gray's Reef NMS that began with scoping for the management plan revision in 1999. Since that time the Gray's Reef Advisory Council has spearheaded a noteworthy consensus process resulting in research area options now in front of the public for discussion. Dr. Kimmel concluded with a review of the marine zoning experiences in the Florida Keys NMS. The successes of those zones were outlined as well as the advisory council and public involvement leading up to a recent reevaluation and lessons learned.

At the conclusion of Dr. Kimmel's talk, Florida Keys NMS Advisory Council Chair Bruce Popham emphasized that the site and council have learned a great deal through their zoning experiences that can be transferred to the other sites. He also noted that despite the advanced position of Florida Keys sanctuary zoning and accountability back to the stakeholders – relative to the other sites in the region – only about 6% of the sanctuary is in truly protected zones. With 3.5 million-4 million visitors per year, the Florida Keys face serious challenges. The recently revised management plan and upcoming regulatory and new zoning work will open a new level of debate. In particular, he noted the inconsistencies between jurisdictions and how that complicates matters for the public. He concluded by noting that the new lessons learned in the Florida Keys will also likely apply to the other sites in the future.

National Marine Sanctuary Foundation

Presenter: Lori Arguelles

Notes by: Jean Prevo

NMSF Highlights:

Incorporated in 2007

Staff: Grown from one volunteer to 7 full-time, soon to grow to 10

Budget: Grown from \$250,000 to \$5.5 million

Funding: 69% Grants 24% Contributions 7% Other
Expenses: 96% Program 2% Fundraising 2% Management

The NMSF just hired Mary Beth Stutzman as the Development Manager at Thunder Bay NMS. The NMSF is currently looking for a logistics coordinator and a full-time grants manager. The NMSF would eventually also like to add a Capital Campaign Director in Monterey and a Development Manager for one of the regions (TBD).

NMSF Vision Statement

The National Marine Sanctuary Foundation inspires and empowers people to enjoy and protect our oceans through the preservation, protection, and promotion of an ocean ethic within marine sanctuaries.

NMSF Mission

The National Marine Sanctuary Foundation was created to preserve, protect and promote America's Underwater Treasures. Through public and private sector partnerships, the NMSF creates conservation-based research, education and outreach programs that support ocean conservation and ocean literacy.

Goal: Increasing Visibility - Increase recognition of the National Marine Sanctuary System as the nation's primary and premier preserver, protector, and promoter of marine natural and cultural resources and values.

Goal: Increasing Education - Significantly increase public awareness of the oceans and other marine and freshwater habitats through the interaction with the National Marine Sanctuary System.

Goal: Increasing Support - Create consistent and significant political, financial, and volunteer support for the National Marine Sanctuary System in order to foster an ocean conservation ethic.

Strategic Initiatives:

- Strengthen Ocean Conservation Policies
- Expand and Enhance Protection of Effectiveness In Special Ocean Places
- Promote and Activate Ocean Stewardship by Increasing Ocean Literacy
- Strengthen and Diversify Organizational Support

Foundation 'Portfolios'

- Project Administration
- Government Relations
- Fundraising
- Special Events
- Grant Administration

Capitol Hill Ocean's Week - June 3-5, 2008

Annual ocean policy symposium - 2008 focus on climate change

Fundraising Highlights

- \$2.2 million for Florida Keys Eco-Discovery Center
- \$614,000 for Stellwagen research
- \$375,000 NOAA 200th

- \$200,000+ each year for Capitol Hill Ocean Week
- \$175,000 for Thank You Ocean campaign
- \$52,500 for MERITO

Little Mermaid PSA Campaign

- **Goals:** To raise awareness among Americans about the health of the oceans. To inspire our audience to prevent pollution before it harms the ocean and the creatures that live there.
- **Target:** 2-12 year olds and their families
- **Key Message:** Help protect & preserve our oceans by recycling & disposing of trash properly.
- **Call to Action:** Learn more...Go to KeepOceansClean.org.
- **RESULTS:** Those respondents with recall of the campaign PSAs were significantly more likely than those without recall to:

Say that protecting the ocean from pollution is extremely important to them (47% ad aware vs. 21% not ad aware)

Say that they are really interested in “learning more about what you can do to help protect the ocean” (68% vs. 41%)

Say that they are really interested in “visiting a website about protecting the ocean” (48% vs. 32%)

Report that, in the past 6 months, they have talked to their parents or other adults about protecting the ocean (39% vs. 16%); talked to their friends about protecting the ocean (25% vs. 9%); and, visited a website about protecting the ocean (16% vs. 4%)

Ocean Awareness Trustfund

- \$5 million federal endowment
- Majority of endowment invested
- Annual awards through RFP process
- \$150,900 awarded to 9 grantees in 2006 out of 30 responses to the RFP
- \$255,475 awarded to 13 grantees in 2007 out of 70 responses to the RFP
- Requirements: Conservation, Connection, Community

Pacific Islands Region Case Study

Presenter: Linda Paul

Notes by: Keeley Belva

Linda Paul, Vice-Chair for the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve Advisory Council (RAC), gave a presentation on the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument. The Monument is a marine protected area that encompasses the Reserve was established after this group last met. Ms. Paul, along with RAC coordinator Keeley Belva, informed the group about the Monument and its management process and discussed some of the differences between the Monument and a sanctuary. The draft management plan for the Monument was recently released and one key difference is that there is not a provision included that would establish a Monument Advisory Council.

West Coast Region Case Study

Presenter: Richard Charter

Notes by: Sarah Ratzesberger

- Introduction: There were many issues that were considered including zoning, management plan review process, alternative energy, but we chose oil spills
- At some point everyone will have to deal with oil spills at our sanctuaries

The Role of the Council in protecting public trust resources from Oil Spill Impacts

- Nov 7th, 2006- It was a beautiful morning in the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary (GFNMS), there was some fog off of Bodega Head and Richard Charter was scheduled to speak to a group of girl scouts who were planning to do a year long project on oceans; they agreed to work on the expansion project of HR 1187
- On his pda he saw a report that there was an oil spill in the bay of 143 gallons
- By the end of the day they had increased the amount of oil to 58,000 gallons, the Cosco Busan container ship had grazed the bridge support
- HR 1187 is now moving it's way through Congress because of the accident
- The establishment of a sanctuary is the only way to get protection from offshore drilling

NRDA to date-

- Birds- 1, 084 collected live, 1, 858 dead, 421 rehabbed
- Mammals- 1 live, 2 dead, 223 observed with oil
- Human use- 50 beaches were closed
- Rocky Intertidal- 50 miles were moderated to heavily oiled
- Sandy Beach- 41 miles oiled
- Saltmarsh- 7.5 miles
- 200 acres of eelgrass

Pollution case settlement:

- There is a cost associated with the response and clean up, penalties, NRDA and restoration costs, other claims both public and private
- Through the habitat equivalency analysis will asses what project will be the most beneficial in relation to the damaged resources
- Role of councils
- Coordinated response exercises,
- Contingency planning
- Ensure adequate spill response in local areas
- Beach Watch Program
- The diversity of the council will bring a broad community perspective to spill issues
- How can fishermen be used?
- Reducing risk of ship accidents
- Areas to be avoided
- In 1969 the Santa Barbara Oil Spill began the birth of the environmental movement, Richard Nixon even spoke of a permanent ban on oil drilling along the coast
- 1979- In Mexican waters US rigs released the largest man made oil spill releasing 30,000 barrels a day

The Process of an Oil Spill

- The spill occurs
- Data collection begins- it is important at this point if there is already some baseline data about the area.
- Public information meetings- people will be upset
- Injury and damage quantification
- Public scoping
- Draft resolution plan
- Injury quantification: wildlife, dying, size, duration, amount
- Habitat size: the percent that has been damaged
- Human uses: money lost per day

State of Oil Spill Legislation

- Ensure that local resources are used in response
- Increase liability limits for container ships
- Ensure better protection for sensitive areas
- Provide more teams to rescue birds
- Improved spill responses from trucks and pipelines
- Grant program better oil spill containment techniques, more booming using better designs
- Increase response standards
- Expanded regulation of hazardous cargo
- Improved notification to local authorities, faster response time
- Technology for real time currents to know where the oil is going
- Improved emergency planning for refineries

What Worked in Cosco Busan Oil Spill

- High level of support from staff and Farallones Marine Sanctuary Association
- 2006 Safe Seas response drill
- Familiarity with other responders and agencies
- Beach watch were trained for response

West Coast Region Break-Out Report

Presenter: Bill Douros

Notes by: Lilli Ferguson

Bill Douros said a major issue in his region is impacts to the ecosystem from fishing. While the program does not want to regulate it, they have been through a process with the Channel Islands, working with the Pacific Fisheries Management Council. It is an idea to get together and talk on a broad agenda. They wondered if council chairs, staff members and superintendents should get together more often on the west coast. One thought is to have superintendents go to different councils to brief them on important things going on in their sites. Alternative energy is also important on the west coast, as well as stopping oil and gas development and promoting sustainable uses. The group agreed to do more fact finding on their own about alternative energy project proposals and impacts. Each sanctuary will probably have their own positions, and there are some regulatory bodies that could issue a permit, while others could not. There was discussion in the group about how the work would be handled, as there are only two and 1/2 regional staff members in that region. With fisheries work, he thinks someone in the region needs to be a fisheries liaison. The group also discussed ecosystem

management, and that maybe the sanctuary program could be the lead in planning on this issue. Other issues that came up were what would a zoning system from Puget Sound to San Diego look like, defining compatible uses, climate change, and policy and science as related to community management. Bill will work more with Liz Moore on defining compatible uses, and will work on involving the councils. The regional group will try to get together again within the next six months.

Southeast/Gulf of Mexico/Caribbean Region Break-Out Report

Presenter: Billy Causey

Notes by: Lilli Ferguson

Billy Causey explained some of the early vision about his region for management and connectivity. The sanctuary program managers decided to use science to guide actions. Regionalization should be an added value and not detract from the sites. The group talked about the connections, going from Cape Hatteras on around into the Gulf, and that upstream of that is the wider Gulf. There are similarities among fish stocks and other resources. The goals for the region were reviewed, and Billy talked about the Islands in the Stream concept, along with proposals for new sites in Puerto Rico, Navassa and other areas. The staff is looking at partnerships upstream and downstream. There is a clear need for more communication and cross fertilization among councils in the region, and it is important to get regional information back to the councils. Different mechanisms were suggested for communication. A handout on the region was suggested, and Billy will consult with Bill Douros, as he liked the west coast model. Finally, the group discussed how councils are broader than fisheries management councils, and that there is a need to set up formal mechanisms where sites within the region are working with the councils and vice versa.

Pacific Islands Region Break-Out Report

Presenter: Allen Tom

Notes by: Allen Tom and Lilli Ferguson

Allen Tom noted that there were three main discussion topics: (1) Holding a regional council chairs meeting; (2) Establishing cross-cuts between sanctuary advisory councils and reserve advisory council (have a liaison from one body sit on the other and vice versa, participate in joint events, develop partnerships, etc); and (3) General council-related issues and how to address them.

- Two sanctuaries in his region share one office, and so staff and expertise is shared. Councils can capitalize on that.
- There is a finite population in Hawaii, so they have had members sit on both, and they wonder if that is a good or bad idea.
- The Humpback Whale and Monument both have large advisory bodies, and there is a desire to cut down the sizes, maybe using the Florida model, where agency representatives attend but are not voting members. Next year, Fagatele Bay representatives will attend this meeting.
- It is difficult to keep abreast of all the regional issues. One idea is to have a Humpback Whale council member sit on the Monument advisory council and vice versa and they would like to all have a joint annual retreat. The retreat could be based on an issue in common like MPR, monk seal, humpback whales, etc

Northeast/Mid-Atlantic/Great Lakes Region Break-Out Report

Presenter: Reed Bohne

Notes by: Nathalie Ward, Reed Bohne and Lilli Ferguson

As an introduction, Reed Bohne, Northeast Regional Superintendent, briefly discussed what the region is doing, the value-added and potential connections to the councils. He encouraged use of this session for “cross-pollination” of councils and issues within the region—asked us to identify commonalities between sites and discuss opportunities, collaborations, projects and improvements.

The group consensus was that this session was a constructive ‘ending’ to the case study presentations; an informal opportunity to meet and interact with our regional director and chairs and coordinators from within our region; and should be included in future meetings.

The unifying theme for all discussions centered on the commonalities /opportunities/ challenges in the Maritime Heritage Program (MHP) across all sites. It was suggested that it would be beneficial to look across MHP regulations at our sites and develop more interaction on our different approaches of access to wrecks.

Additional suggestions included:

1) Connect through coordination of ‘discovery theme” storyline and exploration (e.g. forensics on shipwrecks or evolution of whale research leading to discoveries) to excite people about sanctuaries. Everyone knows of Indiana Jones. We should take advantage of the excitement MHP discoveries create and how NOAA uses advanced technologies in exploration and conservation;

2) Develop a ‘shared’ curriculum that can crosscut regionally based on national education curriculums;

3) "Build a ship-wreck" for each sanctuary (based on Thunder Bay model);

4) Use MHP stories beyond the sites like the “Alligator” expedition to engage interest in NMS MHP conservation and protection;

5) Encourage councils to advocate as appropriate for new MHP oriented sites;

6) Engage councils to contribute to more active dialogue with fishing and diving communities to keep rumors in check about how NMS sites protect wrecks;

5) Promote telepresence of exploration/pioneering technologies/research/education and outreach efforts in all sanctuaries;

6) Identify and advance more cross-pollination between regions (e.g. right whales in Stellwagen Bank and Gray's Reef national marine sanctuaries);

7) Develop more cross-pollination central theme(s) and tools throughout all sanctuaries (e.g. sanctuary fleet of research boats);

8) Create messaging cartoon/animation;

9) Expressed council concerns about the zoning process and interest in learning from other sites how the process is conducted and evaluated for success.

10) Suggested specific joint outreach campaigns such as a 'Logo Beer' for each sanctuary to promote visibility of individual sites and the NMSP, and perhaps serve as a funding mechanism for friends groups.

THURSDAY, MAY 15

Management Plan Review Evolution

Presenter: Ed Lindelof

Notes by: Mike Murray

Ed Lindelof from the ONMS provided a presentation and engaged the council chairs and coordinators in a discussion about the management plan revision process. Ed began by explaining the basic purpose of sanctuary management plans, the rationale for engaging in review and revision, and the status of these efforts at each of the sites. At this time, the Florida Keys NMS (FKNMS) and Gray's Reef NMS (GRNMS) have completed their review processes, Channel Islands NMS (CINMS) and Joint MPR (JMPR) sites are close to completion, Stellwagen Bank NMS (SBNMS) and Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (PMNM) have just released draft management plans, Flower Garden Banks NMS (FGNMS) and Thunder Bay NMS (TBNMS) have draft documents in development, and Fagatele Bay NMS (FBNMS) is in the scoping period. Olympic Coast NMS (OCNMS) and the Monitor NMS will begin the process this year, and Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale NMS (HIHWNMS) will begin in 2009.

Ed then asked council chairs to comment on their experiences with management plan review processes, specifically with respect to which aspects had worked well and which aspects had not. Responses varied but a few common themes emerged. Noted by all involved was the unacceptably excessive amount of time that it is taking the ONMS to complete revised management plans and associated regulation changes, and an acknowledgement of various resultant problems that stem from long delays. Chairs mentioned that these problems include: excessive financial costs to the ONMS, lost opportunities for staff and advisory councils, inability for staff to remain fully dedicated to the task over such a long period, loss of community confidence in the abilities of the sanctuaries, difficulty properly managing council member and public expectations, loss of advisory council familiarity with the plan given membership turnover, loss of advisory council enthusiasm and productivity during lengthy internal development and review stages, and a loss of relevancy of public and council input provided long ago.

On the positive side, there was recognition at multiple sites (MBNMS, HIHWNMS, GFNMS, SBNMS) that the public scoping process had yielded significant community involvement and important input, and had resulted in the identification of a robust range of issues to be considered and addressed by working groups. Susan Farady from the SBNMS Council noted that the unique and inclusive process at SBNMS provided a significant benefit by helping to distinguish the sanctuary's identity. Terrie Klinger with the OCNMS Council noted that the sanctuary wisely addressed a variety of essential tribal issues before starting the management plan revision process.

Some sites (e.g., MBNMS) noted that the up front process stages (i.e., scoping and issue identification) led to a large number of issues, action plans, and activities that were expected to be included within the management plan, and drew the council and its' working groups into a excessive level of detailed work. Other sites (SBNMS, TBNMS) felt that the level of detail their councils were involved in was not problematic. Chris Harrold from the MBNNS Council suggested that perhaps the council should weigh in at a higher strategic level and not be pulled into dozens of working groups engaged in document drafting. He recommended that the product of the council's involvement should be short, sweet, and marketable.

Richard Charter from the GFNMS Council reflected that it seemed that some aspects of the process they experienced was being made up on the fly, and suggested that in the future additional process and document templates provided up front could be helpful. Dan Basta noted, however, that for the unique JMPR process it was impossible not to plow new ground. Richard added that, regardless of difficulties, the process led to greater successes such as the H.R. 1187 boundary expansion bill for GFNMS and Cordell Bank NMS (CBNMS).

Bruce Popham from the FKNMS Council, drawing on his experience with business management and planning, emphasized the relevancy of quickly-updated strategic plans that drive annual plans, the importance of not making the process so complex, using lessons learned to aid in compressing the process, and setting and adhering to real deadlines.

Becky Shortland, staff from the GRNMS, suggested that it could be very helpful if process planning and other preliminary work were addressed at a regional level. This has proven successful in the Southeast/Gulf region with respect to aiding the FGBNMS.

Dianne Black from the CINMS Council pointed out that the longest delays seem to take place during the agency's regulatory clearance process. On this same point, Joe Kimmel from the GRNMS Council noted that the staff does not seem to understand the clearance process and without that timelines cannot be estimated and properly managed.

It was noticeable that those sites which were among the first to begin management plan reviews (CINMS, SBNMS, FKNMS, JMPR sites) seemed to have encountered relatively more problems and delays, while representatives from sites that had more recently begun the review process (FGBNMS, TBNMS) were more satisfied. At the TBNMS, for example, it was noted that the management plan coordinator had done an excellent job working with the advisory council, and that their process had been generally running on schedule.

Following the discussion on pros and cons of the chairs' experiences with management plan revision processes, Ed asked the group to reflect on how advisory councils had handled the processes and what their role had been in contributing to successes and challenges. Linda Paul from the NWHICRER Advisory Council (RAC) described the RAC and working group process that was used at their site, and emphasized the challenges encountered with developing a draft management plan for the PMNM, especially given differences between the ONMS and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) approaches to management.

In response to a question from Ed about prioritization of issues, Chris Harrold from the MBNMS Council explained that the site staff and council seemed to take on everything that came out of the public scoping process, and felt that the council and site would have been better served if the council had taken on a few key areas where progress can be made. Bruce Popham from the FKNMS Council added that prioritization is essential, and that perhaps councils should take on the top three issues rather than 26 (as was done with the JMPR process). Dan Basta commented that it is difficult to prioritize well in the face of uncertainty on issues, and noted that there has been a lack of experience by staff and councils. Dan suggested that the ONMS may at some point be able to offer training to councils and staff.

Anne Walton with the ONMS noted that the “overkill” factor for involvement of councils in some of the management plan processes had a lot to do with building community and stakeholder trust in the sanctuaries. Now that this has been well established, she said, future processes can be simplified.

Ed concluded by summarizing a number of changes and enhancements that the ONMS is now implementing which are targeted at improving the management plan revision process. He briefly described these actions:

- More focus on up front planning:
 - Addressing key questions such as: do we know what we’re getting into, are we ready, and what is the best timing?
 - Working more on understanding the staff and council's vision for the future of the sanctuary
 - Better and more realistic timelines for the process
 - Agreements among various staff and offices as to roles and assignments
- Improved outreach and information
 - Scoping process to be linked to Condition Reports and State of the Sanctuary Reports
- More realistic expectations and priorities
 - Not prioritizing too many issues
 - Dan Basta noted that budget scenarios force prioritization. Approach should be that you have a finite number of “points” to spend on issues. Chris Harrold from the MBNMS Council noted that they flagged issues as “must do”, “should do” and “would be nice.” Susan Farady from the SBNMS Council cautioned that if constraints (e.g., budget) are introduced too early in the process it can be overly limiting, and that such constraints can create an excuse for doing nothing.
- Decoupling of management plans and new/revised regulations
 - Ed stated that regulations will add 18-36 additional months to the process, and the ONMS has little control over that.
 - Becky Shortland from GRNMS responded that there is some debate about the need to delay ALL regulatory action in management plan revisions.
 - Reed Bohne, Northeast/Great Lakes Regional Director, added that in some situations it can be beneficial to couple regulatory changes to a revised management plan.

- Web-based MPR Handbook to become available on line
 - Will offer many helpful templates
- Improved use of veteran staff experience to assist with new MPR processes

Korean Presentation and DVD

Presenter: Dr. Koh Byoung-Seol

Notes By: No notes were taken; this session was brief and added to the agenda.

Three Korean visitors (Dr. Koh Byoung-Seol, National Fisheries Research and Development Institute; Mr. Lee Kiyung, Suncheon Bay Conservation Section, Suncheon City Hall; Dr. Bang In-Kweon, Korea Marine Environmental Management Corporation) attended the week-long meeting to learn more about marine protected area management and specifically sanctuary advisory councils.

Dr. Koh provided a brief presentation and DVD on Korean marine protected areas, focusing on Suncheon Bay. Discussion followed about the potential establishment of citizen advisory groups.

Greening Session: Blue Seas, Green Communities

Presenter: Liz Moore

Notes By: Christine Brammer

Liz Moore provided a presentation on “Greening the ONMS”. Ongoing greening efforts were discussed including the LEED certification that is being pursued for the visitor centers of TBNMS and FKNMS and the Department of Energy MOU to conduct energy audits and test innovative energy technology at ONMS facilities. The sanctuary advisory councils were encouraged to get involved in greening the program through the *Blue Seas Green Communities Initiative*. A letter was sent to each council chair in October of 2007. Sites submitted updates on their council efforts; a handout detailed this information. In the future the ONMS hopes to support training for appropriate staff and in the meantime a proposal for the corporate greening of the program is being developed. Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary distributed a handout on their greening initiatives. Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary discussed an initiative to estimate the carbon footprint of the site; a one-pager is available online at channelislands.noaa.gov.

Program Evaluations and Discussions

Presenters: Helene Scalliet and Elizabeth Moore

Notes by: Nicole Capps

Liz Moore and Helene Scalliet provided an update on the internal and external program evaluations that have occurred in recent years.

In 2004, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) performed an internal Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) evaluation. There are seven PART performance measures: water quality, habitat, living marine resources, characterization, permits,

education and maritime heritage resources. The first three being essential to what the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) does.

The Sanctuary Advisory Council performance measure states that by 2010, Sanctuary Advisory Councils will provide significant input on 150 priority projects across the program. The target of 150 was essentially met in 2007. On Monday, May 12, Advisory Council coordinators and ONMS headquarters staff determined the council performance measure will stand as is until 2010 to create a baseline.

The National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) report in 2007 was generally a positive one. The NAPA report provided suggestions on facilitating MPRs and completing them on a timely basis, completing existing planning documents, cross cutting programs focus on their comparative advantages, use sanctuaries to test innovative approaches to government and reach out and better coordinate with NOAA coastal partners.

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) 2008 review provided nineteen recommendations that the program had to respond to. These recommendations included: increase and enhance enforcement efforts, focus on completing MPRs on a timely basis, improve facilities planning and funding support, provide better coordination between science and outreach staff, avoid duplication of efforts for SIMoN, work with Navy to make high resolution bathymetry data available to ONMS and enhance and improve coordination with NMFS.

The program is looking at another PART review in 2009 and the next external review will probably occur in 2010 or 2011.

Open Session

Facilitated by: Karen Brubeck

Notes by: Andy Palmer

The first part of the open discussion centered on the idea of creating a national advisory council and/or reconstituting the Council of Chairs that was tried in past years. This topic, which was brought to Dan Basta during the Chairs Summit the previous evening, was brought before all the meeting participants during this session.

The current annual meeting format is entirely informational and really does not give a formal structure for providing input to the program. Those in favor of the idea of a national council that would be based on the Council of Chairs argued that the sanctuary advisory council chairs are the best positioned and most knowledgeable of persons to give advice to the program. The chairs, representing the councils could meet at least once a year or more if needed to provide program input. The Council of Chairs could meet with the Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee, the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation Board and other national level bodies. To provide any sort of consensus advice this group would have to be chartered.

Several others noted that when this idea was tried before, it made some of their advisory council members uneasy about the chairs assuming this role. Even though topic areas could be discussed in advance of a meeting of the Council of Chairs, there may be little control of the direction these deliberations could take. Other members noted that we

could individually, informally advise the program with the present format and do most of the things that a formal national advisory committee would do in that capacity and hence may not need a more formal structure to accomplish what we want. Other concerns included the time commitment involved from council chairs that are already likely overextended at the local level. Concern about how this impacts the “politics” of local advisory councils if councils knew their chair would serve on a national advisory body. For example, fishing seats or conservation seats may not be elected as chairs due to this additional role they would serve outside the council.

Dan Basta will draft a letter to the councils sounding them out on the concept of a national role for council chairs; the council chairs will review the draft and provide comment back to Dan. Dan will finalize and send the official letter to the council chairs, and they will take the issue to their full councils for discussion and input. Once Dan has input back from all the councils, next steps will be taken.

The second part of the open session focused on possible HQ reorganization proposals within the program. One idea is to shift the sanctuary advisory councils out of the policy branch to the education and outreach branch. Dan said this idea is being considered because outreach is an important task of sanctuary advisory councils. On the other hand, he noted that much of the output of the councils is policy oriented. A firm decision one way or the other has not been made yet.

An idea was also put forth to focus an annual meeting (or at a minimum, a session) on indigenous cultures in and near our sanctuary communities--perhaps focusing on using indigenous traditions and knowledge to more effectively manage sanctuary resources.

Close-Out Session

Presenter: Karen Brubeck

Notes by: Karen Brubeck

Karen highlighted: (1) summary of meeting follow-up/action items; (2) volunteers for 2009 meeting agenda working group; and (3) written meeting evaluations.

Major action items coming out of the meeting include the following: Ed Lindelof will provide a write-up of the MPR clearance process to meeting participants; Helene Scalliet will work with council coordinators to firm up the council performance measure guidance; perhaps including a question that further links the input back to resource protection; ONMS will provide information on law enforcement in sanctuaries; Dan will write a letter regarding a possible national advisory council (as discussed in the “Open Session” notes above); and Karen will distribute meeting notes.

Karen proposed a 2009 meeting agenda working group composed of perhaps two council chairs and two council coordinators, working with Karen and other ONMS HQ staff to develop the agenda for next year’s meeting. All council chairs and coordinators would still review. We would rely heavily on the meeting evaluations. The working group would allow for input earlier into the process and a hand in developing the agenda. It would likely entail 2-3 conference calls starting in the summer. The following individuals volunteered:

- Jean Prevo, TBNMS Council Coordinator

- Steve Kroll, TBNMS Council Chair
- Nicole Capps, MBNMS Council Coordinator
- Jennifer Morgan, FGBNMS Council Coordinator
- Mike Murray, CINMS Deputy Superintendent and Council Coordinator
- Lance Morgan, CBNMS Council Chair
- Lilli Ferguson, FKNMS Council Coordinator

Karen then requested that everyone take a few moments to fill out the meeting evaluation forms to assist with future meeting planning, thanked everyone for a great week, thanked the *Monitor* NMS for hosting, and adjourned the meeting.

- Meeting Participant List -

Channel Islands NMS

Dianne Black, Council Chair

Mike Murray, Deputy Superintendent and Council Coordinator

Cordell Bank NMS

Lance Morgan, Council Chair

Fagatele Bay NMS

Allen Tom, Pacific Islands Regional Director (representing the site and the region)

Florida Keys NMS

Bruce Popham, Council Chair

Lilli Ferguson, Council Coordinator

Flower Garden Banks NMS

Irby Basco, Council Vice Chair

Jennifer Morgan, Council Coordinator

Gulf of the Farallones NMS

Richard Charter, Council Chair

Sarah Ratzesberger, Council Coordinator Asst

Gray's Reef NMS

Joe Kimmel, Council Chair

Becky Shortland, Council Coordinator

Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale NMS

Bill Friedl, Council Chair

Christine Brammer, Acting Council Coordinator

Monitor NMS

Joseph Schwarzer, Council Chair

Scott Boyd, Citizen-At-Large Seat

James Bunch, Recreational Diving Seat

Dave Alberg, Sanctuary Superintendent

Shannon Ricles, Council Coordinator

Monterey Bay NMS

Chris Harrold, Council Chair

Nicole Capps, Council Coordinator

Olympic Coast NMS

Terrie Klinger, Council Chair

Andy Palmer, Council Coordinator

Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument

Linda Paul, Vice Council Chair

Keeley Belva, Council Coordinator

Stellwagen Bank NMS

Susan Farady, Council Chair

Nathalie Ward, Council Coordinator

Thunder Bay NMS

Steve Kroll, Council Chair

Jean Prevo, Council Coordinator

ONMS Regional Directors

Reed Bohne

Billy Causey

Bill Douros

Allen Tom

ONMS HQ Staff

Daniel J. Basta

Karen Brubeck

June Cradick

Matt Dozier

Ed Lindelof

Michiko Martin

Elizabeth Moore

Paul Orlando

Helene Scalliet

Kate Thompson

Anne Walton

Other Presenters and Guests

Lori Arguelles, National Marine Sanctuary Foundation

Dr. Koh Byoung-Seol, National Fisheries Research and Development Institute

Mr. Lee Kiyung, Suncheon Bay Conservation Section, Suncheon City Hall

Dr. Bang In-Kweon, Korea Marine Environmental Management Corporation